



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/704,968	11/02/2000	Tetsuo Shibanuma	097929-4689	4432	
7:	7590 11/12/2004			EXAMINER	
David R Metzger Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal P O Box #016080 Wacker Drive Station Chicago, IL 60606-1080			HUANG, EVELYN MEI		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1625		
			DATE MAILED: 11/12/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/704,968	SHIANUMA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Evelyn Huang	1625
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing - earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from b, cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. C (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
 1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 A 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 11 and 26-28 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 11 and 26-28 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the E drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	es have been received. Es have been received in Application Entrity documents have been receive Entrity (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
•••		
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)	

Application/Control Number: 09/704,968

Art Unit: 1625

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 11, 26-28 are pending. Claims 1-10, 12-21 have been canceled according to the supplemental amendment filed on 3-9-2004. Claims 22-25 have been canceled according to the amendment filed on 8-2-2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is maintained because it is applicable to new claims 26-28.

The subgenus recited in claims 26-28 is not described in the specification, although species falling within the subgenus is described in the specification as Applicant points out in the Remarks. The court, however, has held that 'whatever may be the viability of an inductive-deductive approach to arriving at a claimed subgenus, it cannot be said that such a subgenus is necessarily described by a genus encompassing it and a species upon which it reads." In re Wilder, 736 F.2d 1516, 1520, 222 USPQ 369, 372 (Fed. Cir. 1984). See MPEP 2163.05. Furthermore, a description for the instant R8, R9, R10 is not found in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The rejection for Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention is withdrawn because the amendment has obviated the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The cancellation of Claims 22, 24, 25 has rendered moot the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sugihara (Analytical Sciences, 1993, 9:593-597, PTO-1449).

Art Unit: 1625

Double Patenting

5. The provisional rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 13, 14 of copending Application No. 10/656659 is maintained for reasons of record because it is applicable to new claim 27, corresponding to the canceled claim 24 (formula III).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 11, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugihara (Analytical Sciences, 1993, 9:593-597, PTO-1449).

Sugihara discloses 1,10-phenanthroline compounds as neutral carriers for Li⁺ sensitive electrodes.

Sugihara's compounds 4 and 6 have a methyl and butyl respectively whereas the compound of instant claim 11 has an ethyl, propyl or pentyl as R1 or R2 (corresponding to R in Sugihara).

Sugihara's compound 8 has an ethyl whereas the compound of instant claim 28 has a methyl as R10.

The instant is therefore the adjacent homolog of the prior art compound. The prior compound suggests the instant. These adjacent homologs are of sufficiently close structural similarity that there is a presumed expectation that such compounds possess similar properties. In re Wilder, 195 USPQ, 426. Indeed, Sugihara's compound 4, 6, 8 have similar selectivity (page 595, Table 1).

Application/Control Number: 09/704,968 Page 4

Art Unit: 1625

At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to replace the substituent of Sugihara's example compound with the adjacent homolog to arrive at the instant invention with the reasonable expectation of obtaining an additional compound useful as neutral carriers for Li⁺ sensitive electrodes.

8. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugihara (Analytical Sciences, 1993, 9: 593-597, PTO-1449) in view of Daniel (4853090).

Sugihara discloses 1,10-phenanthroline compounds as neutral carriers for Li⁺ sensitive electrodes.

Sugihara's Compound 14 (page 593) differs from the instant compound in not having a methyl on the 2, 9 –diphenyl substituents on the phenanthroline. The instant methylphenyl is therefore homologous to the unsubstituted phenyl of Sugihara.

However, an addition of a methyl to a known compound is ordinarily not patentable. In re Wood 199 USPQ 137; In re Lohr, 137 USPQ 548. The reference suggests the instant. The skilled artisan would be motivated to modify Sugihara's compound by the addition of a methyl to the phenyl on the phenanthroline to arrive at the instant invention because compounds of such close structural relationship are expected to have similar activities. Furthermore, In a similar lithium ion-selective electrodes based on 1, 10-phenanthroline, Daniel teaches that the phenyl may be optionally substituted with alkyl(s) (column 6, lines 5-38) An example of methyl substituted phenyl is described (column 35, compound XXI; column 37, compound XXVI). The skilled artisan would therefore be motivated to modify Sugihara's compound by addition of methyl(s) to the phenyl as taught by Daniel to arrive at the instant invention because compounds of close structural relationship are expected to have similar activities.

Conclusion

9. No claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 1625

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Evelyn Huang whose telephone number is 571-272-0686. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang can be reached on 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1625